

New York Tribune.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1913.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Charles M. Reid, President; Conde Hamilton, Secretary; James M. Barrett, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$3.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year. \$5.00
Daily only, 6 mos. 4.25
Daily only, 1 year. 7.50
Sunday only, 6 mos. 1.25
Sunday only, 1 year. 2.50
Daily only, 1 month. .50

FOREIGN RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$3.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year. \$5.00
Daily only, 6 mos. 4.25
Daily only, 1 year. 7.50
Sunday only, 6 mos. 1.25
Sunday only, 1 year. 2.50
Daily only, 1 month. .50

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

The Tribune uses its best endeavors to insure the trustworthiness of every advertisement it prints and to avoid the publication of all advertisements containing misleading statements or claims.

More Talent in Sight for the McCall Campaign.

The Hon. John J. Fitzgerald ought to be engaged to manage the literary bureau of the McCall campaign, supplementing the labors of the Hon. Asa B. Gardiner. Colonel Gardiner can write the notices eulogizing Mr. McCall's "loyalty" to the noble organization which nominated him and demonstrating his superiority as a candidate on that account to former Tammany nominees, like Mayor Gaynor, who was an "ingrate" and a "failure," or Mayor McClellan, "that little fellow who thought he could elect himself Governor or President by breaking away from Tammany Hall."

Representative Fitzgerald, on the other hand, could second the candidate's contention that he is "no man's man" and entitled, as "The Sun" is also fond of proving, to be considered the leading "anti-Murphyite" on the Murphy ticket. In a speech in the House of Representatives the other day the Brooklyn Congressman showed what he could do in the way of demonstrating that "Tammany is only a nickname." He referred with great bitterness to the fact that the most conspicuous Democratic federal officeholder in this city had accepted the fusion nomination for Mayor, and endeavored to excite the sympathy of Southern and Western Democrats by picturing Murphy's success in recapturing full control here as essential to the welfare of the national Democratic party. Said Mr. Fitzgerald, lugubriously:

Think of the situation now existing in the City of New York! A campaign of momentous importance to the Democratic party is being waged. All the enemies of Democracy in the city and in the country are aligned in an effort to overthrow the organized Democracy in their attempt to place Democratic officials in power. The candidate of these enemies of the Democratic party is a Democratic official, appointed by a Democratic President and confirmed by a Democratic Senate. . . . What will happen one year from this fall if this attempt by the combined enemies of Democracy in a great city to defeat the Democratic party is successful and Democratic candidates for Congress appeal for the suffrages of the people?

Southern and Western Democrats could only have been amused by such confusion of language.

They know too well to what degree the Murphyized Democracy of this city embodies true Democratic principles. They have seen Tammany at national conventions. They remember Croker, and are still resentful over the spectacle of a personage like Murphy throwing New York's 90 delegates on the bargain counter at the last national convention, at Baltimore. They recall also that at Murphy's bidding Mr. Fitzgerald himself, with other Tammany Democrats, deserted his party in the House a few years ago in order to save Speaker Cannon and to prolong for another session the repressive legislative system known as Cannonism.

Southern and Western Democrats are not to be caught with such chaff as the assertion that a title given to a New York City candidate by Murphy and his Delmonico Council of Eight must be recognized as *prima facie* Democratic. Most Democratic voters outside this city loathe Tammany and would rejoice to see its misuse of the Democratic label ended. Mr. Fitzgerald therefore wastes his talents arguing with skeptics in Washington. He ought to be brought home, where there are still some voters self-deluded enough to think that "Tammany is only a nickname" and that they can safely support Murphy nominees on the theory that they are Democrats first and Murphyites afterward.

Ensnared at the McCall headquarters, Mr. Fitzgerald would probably be able to prove to the satisfaction of "The Sun" that Democracy spoke when Murphy drew McCall's name out of his hat and that a Democratic administration at Washington has been perverse and "disloyal" in not disciplining the Collector of the Port for accepting an anti-Tammany nomination for Mayor on the platform that defeat of the plunderers now operating under the Democratic emblem is a public necessity. Mr. Fitzgerald is more needed at the Murphy-McCall headquarters than even that former Knight of the Shovel, the Hon. "Joe" Johnson.

Economy and Profits in Condemnation.

The people of this state will have presented to them again on Election Day a proposed amendment to the constitution designed to reduce the cost of condemning private property for public use, which was defeated two years ago. It went down then because it was linked with several other highly unpopular and the voters slaughtered the lot. It deserves a better fate this year.

Amendment No. 1 permits condemnation proceedings to be held before a Supreme Court Justice, with or without a jury, and permits a municipality in condemning property for laying out or changing streets, parks and public places to take enough extra land to form building sites abutting on the proposed improvement. This extra land, after the improvement is finished, may be leased or sold.

There is nothing revolutionary in this plan. It has been in use for many years in European cities, where much of the cost of public improvements is paid for by the profit made out of selling such plots taken by the so-called excess condemnation. Philadelphia and Boston have it. It is only fair, since the city creates an extra value for these plots by making the public improvement, that the taxpayers should obtain the benefit, rather than some shrewd politician with friends on the "inside," who gets options on all the property in the vicinity of the proposed improvement.

Holding condemnation hearings before a Supreme Court justice would put an end to the condemnation commissioner graft, which costs this city more money in a year than all its judges receive. The amendment is supported by the state

conference of Mayors and by the administration of New York City. It is non-political. It deserves the approval of the voters, to whose benefit it will operate.

Timothy L. Woodruff.

By the death of Timothy L. Woodruff New York loses an active and useful citizen. Mr. Woodruff, unlike many other men of independent fortune, took his civic obligations seriously. He engaged in politics not as a means of livelihood but as a career in which a capable and honest man might properly aspire to leadership. He learned the business of party management and gave many years of his life to it, but it was never his ambition to get anything out of such activities which he could not accept with clean hands and a clear conscience. In an era of great laxity of standards among politicians his name was never tarnished by suspicions of personal or political corruption.

Mr. Woodruff attained distinction as a party leader and was three times elected, Lieutenant Governor of this state. He retained his influence in Brooklyn through many political vicissitudes, not the least of which was his espousal of the Progressive cause last year. The public esteemed him because it knew that he was a citizen first and a politician afterward, and his popularity was based on many good deeds and kindly services. He helped materially last summer to allay factional disputes and to bring the Progressive party into line for the fusion ticket, and on his last public appearance, at Cooper Union, it fell to him to congratulate on behalf of the Progressives the candidates whom a non-partisan union had put in the field.

New York would be fortunate if it had more citizens willing to do the sort of work for local betterment which Mr. Woodruff did.

Making It Easier to Meet "Fixed Charges."

The twice-a-week Cabinet meeting at the White House is a thing of the past. It did not long survive the advent of the era of the New Freedom in Cabinet activities and side show enterprises. It is now announced from Washington that the old-fashioned gatherings for the exchange of counsel or the swapping of stories and gossip, suspended last July, will never be renewed.

On utilitarian grounds they can well be spared. When the Cabinet consisted of four, or even six, heads of departments all the members could discuss all questions submitted. But with ten men about the board general discussion becomes laborious, and on most questions the advice of not more than three or four members is needed. Individual or small group consultations save time and friction.

No doubt the Cabinet circle is glad to get rid of the cumbersome semi-weekly council of war. Besides, what an awkward burden two such weekly fixtures would be on those whose "fixed charges" may have to be taken care of at any moment through revenue raising expeditions around the Chautauqua circuits!

"C-543."

With a record of 283 eggs in one year, hen C-543, of the Oregon Agricultural College, has received the title of "the greatest hen in the world." This record by one hen is of interest in connection with the government statistics, published this morning, showing that twenty-one million dozen eggs were exported from the United States in the last fiscal year, valued at practically \$4,500,000, which is a stupendous increase from the \$33,297 in value exported in 1893.

If all American hens were as busy as C-543 the array of figures required to represent the product of their labor would be staggering, but while they are not there is sufficient activity among them to make our exports seem negligible in comparison with the production for home use. The figures for the calendar year 1912 give a good idea of the place "biddy" occupies in farm and home life. The records for this city alone showed that 4,723,558 cases of thirty dozen each, or 141,706,740 dozen, a total of 1,706,480,880 eggs, were received here. Their value, at the average export price of 21½ cents a dozen, was \$3,466,949.50, and this is for only one city in the United States. Verily, they reckon ill who leave the hen out when figuring up the cost of living.

The Episcopal General Convention.

The Episcopal General Convention, now in session in this city, has attracted widespread attention, partly because it is the first national gathering of that Church to meet in the splendid new Synod Hall of the Episcopal Cathedral, but more especially because it will discuss matters of great moment to those outside as well as inside the Church. Although the Episcopal Church is a comparatively small body, it has a prestige and influence out of all proportion to its numbers, especially in the larger cities, and has come to be regarded as the bulwark of conservative thought and tradition, not only in the sphere of religion but in its attitude toward the social and industrial questions of the day.

But it would be a mistake to assume that even the conservatives in the Church are quite satisfied with things as they are. Its most enlightened members, whether High, Low or Broad, agree in believing that while the Church has been holding aloof from the "sects" it has itself been somewhat sectarian in its attitude and methods. And each of these three historic parties is offering a general programme which in its opinion would bring the Church into closer and more sympathetic touch with modern life.

The remedy proposed by the High Churchmen is that the Church align itself, not only in fact but in name, with the civilization, traditions and ideals of Catholic Christianity previous to the Reformation. Hence the agitation for the dropping of the word Protestant from the name of the Church, which is to come up again in this convention. The Catholics in the Church honestly and earnestly believe that such a repudiation of Protestantism would eventually draw to the Church the multitudes of plain people who are confused by the conflicting claims of the "sects" and who in all the momentous affairs of life crave a supreme authoritative voice above everything else.

While the Low and Broad Churchmen are united in opposing the propaganda of the Catholics, they do not altogether agree among themselves. The traditional Low Churchmen want to emphasize the hostility of the Church toward the doctrines and practices of unreformed Catholicism; and they are therefore disposed to hark back to the religious controversies of the Reformation period. The Broad Churchmen, on the other hand, think of Protestantism not so much as a protest against certain theological doctrines as the witnessing for certain great positive beliefs, rights, privileges and ideals which have become the heritage of modern civilization. Therefore, from their point of view

Protestantism is no longer fighting Catholicism, but both Protestantism and Catholicism are reaching the larger outlook of co-operation due to respect for each other's honest beliefs. Both are coming more and more to lay the supreme emphasis on their basic points of agreement, and both are striving, uncertainly but none the less surely, to erect upon these basic points of agreement the enduring foundation of a world-wide human brotherhood, each creed finding its ultimate expression in the impulse of service to man.

Such are the currents and counter currents of thought and belief that are at work in this great body, and the outcome of its deliberations will therefore be a matter of profound interest to the public in general.

Up at Albany some people seem disposed to celebrate our new holiday as Eviction Day.

Fire Commissioner Joseph Johnson is advertised as the "wit of the McCall campaign." It must be admitted that he has had wit enough so far to hold on to his municipal job.

Before the shades of night fall again shall we see the goods and chattels of the tenant of the People's House piled up on the sidewalk?

THE TALK OF THE DAY.

Josephus Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy, tells this little story concerning two colored brethren: "Two darkies bought some pork, and Sam, having no place to put his share, trusted it to Henry's keeping. When they met the following night Henry said: 'A most strange thing happened at my house last night, Sam. All my 'try to me.'"

"What was that, Henry?"
"Well, Sam," said Henry, solemnly, "dis mawnin' I goes down in de cellar for to git a piece o' hawg meat fo' breakfast, I put my han' down in de brine bar'l, an' Sam, sho' as preachin', de rats had done eat a hole clear fro' de bottom of dat bar'l en dragged de meat all out."

"Why didn't de brine run outen de hole, Henry?" Sam asked.

"Well, yo' see, Sam," replied Henry, "dat's de myst'ry."

Tommy—Pop, what do we mean by superfluous? Tommy's Pop—Superfluous, my son, means—well, it's like a bachelor giving advice to a married man.—Philadelphia Record.

London's expert in "futures"—Old Moore—has made his predictions for the coming year a little earlier than usual. They are for the most part of a sombre nature and include disasters and sorrow breeding occurrences in all parts of the world. "One ray of light," says "Le Cri de Paris," "is seen on the black horizon. The prophet promises suffragette victories after the British Parliament has been besieged in March and April." Among the cheerful things predicted for the United States are explosions of mine damp, violent windstorms and epidemics.

"What's Wombat irritated about now?"
"These shocking transparent skirts."
"Why should they make him peevish?"
"He hears about 'em, but never sees any."—Pittsburgh Post.

Former Senator Chauncey M. Depew is a great stickler for organization control in politics. In the recent Republican primary election, through an oversight, Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, was not designated as a candidate for delegate to the state convention from the 27th Assembly District. So the leader posted a man at each polling place to say it was the wish of the organization that Mr. Stimson's name be written in the ballot as a substitute. "Harry Stimson is a good friend of mine, but I don't believe in scratching my ballot," said Senator Depew, when the proposition was placed before him by a young man he did not know. When the worker persisted that it was the wish of the organization, the Senator called up county headquarters. After the situation was explained to him by Samuel S. Koenig, the county leader, the Senator returned to the booth and scratched the ballot "In accordance with orders."

They were trying an Irishman charged with a petty offence in an Oklahoma town, when the judge asked:
"Have you any one in court who will vouch for your good character?"
"Yes, your honor," quickly responded the Celt; "there's the Sheriff there."
Whereupon the Sheriff evinced signs of great amazement. "Why, your honor," declared he, "I don't even know the man."
"Observe, your honor," said the Irishman triumphantly, "observe that I've lived in the country for over twelve years and the Sheriff doesn't know me yet! Ain't that a character for ye?"—Tit-Bits.

THE "SIT-PATTERS."



THE PEOPLE'S COLUMN

An Open Forum for Public Debate.

THE ECONOMICS OF MARRIAGE

One View of the Rational Basis of Society.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Apropos of married women teachers being dismissed from the service when they have babies, Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch asks in The Tribune of the 10th: "Aren't there hundreds of wives and mothers working in factories, cleaning offices and sewing in sweatshops? Why, yes, of course there are, and since that sort of thing is so good for both mothers and babies, push it along and have teachers with little babies doing double duty—trying to serve two masters—and falling more or less toward each."

It is not the husband or the home, but the baby, that constitutes one master, and the school is the other.

But Mrs. Blatch does not touch the heart of the question. The mother works in the factory or the sweatshop because she has to support herself and her children. It is different with the teacher mother. In all the cases brought to public notice of teachers who have chosen to have babies, I recall no case where the husband was not an efficient bread winner. In cases where the husband is not a sufficiently satisfactory bread winner to allow the wife to leave the service, I would say frankly, they ought to refrain from having children.

And now Mrs. Blatch and others will lift up their hands in holy horror and accuse me of advocating immorality. Not on your life!

This is a question of economics, pure and simple, and I stand for an economic system which will enable every man to maintain a family well—thus encouraging marriage, the family and morality.

When Mrs. Blatch gets her eyes open to this rational and fundamental basis for society, as her good friend Alice Stone Blackwell has long since done.

JONATHAN C. RIERCE.

White Plains, N. Y., Oct. 10, 1913.

CENSORSHIP FOR THE MOVIES

Canon Chase Urges Support for Aldermen Who Helped His Cause.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: On Tuesday, September 30, Alderman Morrison, of Brooklyn, asked the Board of Aldermen of New York City to enact the section providing for a censorship of motion pictures by the Board of Education in exactly the same form as it was adopted by a vote of 79 to 1 and vetoed by Mayor Gaynor.

Alderman Folks, who has said he favored censorship and would assist to get such an ordinance enacted into law, if it were separated from the Folks ordinance, which is now the law, moved to refer the censorship ordinance to the Law and Legislation Committee.

The Tammany aldermen refused to vote. Six Republican aldermen wanted the censorship ordinance enacted at once. They were Dotzler, Downing, Gaynor, Morrison, Pendry and Post. The Republicans who voted to refer the matter to the committee were Bolles, Boschen, Rosse, Brush, Coleman, Eichhorn, Folks, Hamilton, Marks, Martyn, Moore, Mullbauer, Mulligan, Nicol, O'Rourke, Stevenson, Well, Wilcox and Esterbrook. All friends of the children should urge their aldermen to vote to discharge the committee on Tuesday, October 14, if the committee tries to dodge the issue by failing to report.

The Republicans ought to accept this challenge of Tammany and prove that they are free from the control of the motion picture manufacturers who oppose censorship. The new Simmons-Underwood tariff bill provides for a censorship of all motion picture films imported into this country. Eventually we will probably have a United States censorship law, but until that time New York City ought to have a law which would protect the children from such immoral films as "The Wages of Sin," which was approved last June by the so-called National Board of Censorship, and which depicted "Jack" Rose, "Sam" Schepps and "Harry" Vallon, noted in the Rosenthal case as confessed gamblers, in a film full of gambling, crime and murder.

THE CRIME OF MOTHERHOOD

What a Mother of Pupils Thinks of the Question.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial "The Crime of Motherhood" is excellent, but it seems quite time the mothers of the pupils said a word or two on this important subject. Far be it from me to suggest it is none of the august board's business what their teachers do after hours, provided they carry out their contracts.

The point is—should we—can and do they teach—not only that mysterious thing called school but morals and manners and upbuilding of character? I am entirely unacquainted with the women who have precipitated this controversy, but speak as the mother of two daughters who have graduated from grammar school and Wadleigh High, and am therefore in a position to know something about both teachers and "the system."

After careful thought and due consideration of all the teachers who tried experiments upon my daughters I am convinced that two of the very best teachers were married women. One of them not only managed a husband after hours, but contrived to rear two clever children. According to the logic of our highly enlightened board, these kiddies should have been incorrigible or imbeciles, but the fact is they are bright, clever and altogether lovely.

How this teacher-mother did then when "she comes home from her tired day in school and is unfit to conduct that healthful and joyous intercourse with her child which she would otherwise be able to do!" I do not pretend to know. It was none of my business, and I never meddled with her private affairs. It was enough for me that she was a thoroughly capable teacher, conscientiously devoted to developing the brain and character of my children.

But this much I know—when Mrs. Daskam retired from service the honorable board lost one of its very best teachers, and when Mrs. Emma Clarke quit teaching to become a mother another most excellent teacher was lost to this town.

Is it possible any one is really so stupid he doesn't know that teaching is an exceptional gift—really an art in itself—that the great majority of our teachers cannot teach? I firmly believe if those women who have incurred the grave displeasure of our honorable board could teach before they were married not even motherhood, with all its cares and responsibilities, will unfit them for the onerous duties they engage to perform. And it is not only a matter of grave regret but a distinct loss to the community that any good teacher should be permitted to quit. The board should down on its knees and beg them to return, or to be quite consistent, should at once dismiss from its ranks those married men who presume to be fathers. Methinks I have heard

they are not always agreeable, nor do they conduct any too much "joyous intercourse" on the family hearthstone when they happen to be tired.

"The cases are entirely dissimilar!" I agree with you. Teachers are dissimilar—no two alike—and the good teachers should be retained—married or single, divorced or widowed—no matter what the cost.

ONE OF THE MOTHERS OF THE PUPILS.
New York, Oct. 10, 1913.

IN DEFENCE OF HUSBANDS

A Case Is Cited and a Sorrowful Complaint Uttered.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In recent issues of the New York Tapers a wife related her marital woes, accusing the "other woman" of a sort of hypnotism over her husband. She complained that "once he is free from this woman's influence it will be easy to help him become a man again!"

Granting that all husbands are poor fools and but weak prey for the designing "other woman," except for friend wives watchful care, is it not possible that sometimes that "influence" may be merely the kindness, courtesy and respect the husband has never received at home?

It is unfortunate that public sympathy in marital troubles is so persistently with the wife. Conscious security offers the temptress wife great temptation. Knowing that fleeing husbands, under provocation, are foredoomed by the push as rascals, wives can safely inflict every form of domestic torture. Yea, and even taunt husbands with their power! If occasionally a husband has committed the indiscretion to escape from his marriage and accepted affection from another woman, the wife's golden opportunity has arrived. She has only to rush into print with a pitiful story of how tenderly she has loved her husband, how kindly she has treated him, how unwarrantably he remains away from her, and how evilly "the wicked other woman" has torn him from her faithful, forgiving arms, to win for herself a torrent of public sympathy!

I speak from experience, in my capacity of husband. No doubt I am to blame, but I have exhausted my intelligence and my patience in my effort to win courtesy, affection and respect from my wife. I have failed utterly to make my home resemble what the term "home" means. I have tried twenty years. Now I live alone. My wife unceasingly threatens to "ruin me in the eyes of the world" if I apply for a divorce. As yet I have not had the good fortune to meet "the other woman." That I shall meet her is a foregone conclusion. I am still a young man and I am hungry for affection and companionship.

When I do meet her, what the "other woman" will have to suffer at the hands of my wife I dread to think. That she will be accused of the failure of our entire married life will be a revenge too sweet for such women as my wife to renounce!

I repeat, it is unfortunate that public sympathy is always unquestionably with the wife.
EDWARD CARSON.
New York, Oct. 10, 1913.

IN TAMMANY'S POWER.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: With Mr. Glynn as Governor and Mr. McCall as Mayor, what degree of constraint will Mr. Murphy exercise upon District Attorney Whitman, or is Mr. Whitman "all in good time" to be removed also?

You recollect that the Court of Appeals has held that the removal of a district attorney cannot be reviewed by the courts, but "goes as it lays."
JOHN LEARY.
New York, Oct. 11, 1913.

THEY DESERVE NO SYMPATHY.

From The Hartford Courant.

New York reports the capture of another "wire-tapper." They're a bad lot, but how much better are their victims? Like the green goods and the men, they tempt some fellow with the chance for him to cheat somebody else, and then they cheat him. It's really done at dock, and the dot of most respectable life is the one that gets eaten. Why be sorry for him?